

[viXra.org](https://vixra.org) > [Quantum Gravity and String Theory](#) > viXra:1111.0111



Donate To
viXra.org

Search viXra.org

Quantum Gravity and String Theory



U(1) X SU(2) X Su(3) Quantum Gravity Successes

Authors: [Nige Cook](#)

See paper for technical abstract. Paper covers checked predictions for a theory which modifies the Standard Model's electroweak group representations to include quantum gravity, replacing the Higgs mechanism with checkable predictions. The model correctly predicted the cosmological acceleration in 1996. Full references, analysis, and feedback from peer-reviewed string theory dominated journals is included.

Comments: 63 Pages.

Download: [PDF](#)

Submission history

[[v1](#)] 2011-11-29 20:40:03

Unique-IP document downloads: 1365 times

Vixra.org is a pre-print repository rather than a journal. Articles hosted may not yet have been verified by peer-review and should be treated as preliminary. In particular, anything that appears to include financial or legal advice or proposed medical treatments should be treated with due caution. Vixra.org will not be responsible for any consequences of actions that result from any form of use of any documents on this website.

Add your own feedback and questions here:

You are equally welcome to be positive or negative about any paper but please be polite. If you are being critical you must mention at least one specific error; otherwise your comment will be deleted as unhelpful.



Join the discussion...

♡

Share

Best

Newest

Oldest



Nige Cook

17 days ago

Please note that the hyperlink in reference 29 of this paper (on page 63) comes up with "page not found", but this is just a defect on the Quark Xpress typesetting software which wrongly inserted a hyphen into the word "lesson" in the html link (giving <http://kea-monad.blogspot.c...> when in fact the link I typed was <http://kea-monad.blogspot.c...> which works correctly, containing my discussion with the late lawyer and (alternative ideas) superstring theorist Tony Smith, where he admits: "Since my view is that '... the color (red, blue, green) comes from the position of the singleton (0 or 1) in the given binary triple ...[such as]...

i = 100 = red up quark
j = 010 = blue up quark
k = 001 = green up quark ...

"I agree that color emerges from '... the geometry that confined particles assume in close proximity ...'"

(This particular reference is essentially important because in this whole miserable business of opposing groupthink hubris, paranoia and propaganda in string theory, there is some consensus on alternative ideas, never admitted by the mainstream guys like Baez which insists that opposition is loner activity lacking collaboration and PEER-REVIEW of ideas. So much for that myth!)

0 0 Reply • Share ›

N

nc

5 months ago

Please read this paper FIRST (it is a later paper and only 1 page long):
<https://vixra.org/pdf/1305....>

0 0 Reply • Share ›



Nige Cook

9 years ago

Updated ideas~ <http://nige.wordpress.com/2...>

0 0 Reply • Share ›



Nige Cook

9 years ago

Please see also <http://vixra.org/abs/1405.0274> which develops further the arguments and

[Contact](#) - [Disclaimer](#) - [Privacy](#) - [Funding](#) - [Justify the extensive results](#) given in the earlier 30 November 2011 vixra paper

0 0 Reply • Share ›

Third-Party Links:



N

Nige

10 years ago

<http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> was submitted (Foundations of Physics submission FOOP2945) to Gerard 't Hooft, Chief Editor of "Foundations of Physics", who emailed on January 11, 2012: "Both the structure and the unduly high degree of speculativeness of the arguments presented in this manuscript place it outside the scope of Foundations of Physics." This is precisely the opposite of the confirmed predictions based on facts which are given in the paper, and are precisely what the paper itself says about mainstream "string theory" trash hype, which contains no checkable predictions and is poorly structured with a landscape of 10^{500} metastable vacua. However, to remove all excuses, a briefer version cut from 63 pages to 7 pages and now hosted at <http://vixra.org/abs/1302.0004> with the detailed literature survey including 43 references completely removed was prepared in order to focus concisely on the key prediction and its confirmed, factual basis (Foundations of Physics submission FOOP-D-13-00076). Gerard 't Hooft has emailed on 28 February 2013 by reversing his original 2012 criteria: "The author of this manuscript fails to make clear how his work relates to current discussions in the foundations of physics. Regrettably, this fact places the current submission outside the scope of Foundations of Physics. This is displayed by a lack of references to recent literature."

This contradicts the original submission, which DID have a recent literature survey of 43 references (<http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111>) and a very detailed discussion of how the new result overthrows "current discussions in the foundations of physics." These 43 references were removed in the resubmission to force the peer reviewers to focus on the accuracy of the scientific calculations and their factual, defensible basis. First the man claimed that the discussion of the problems in existing research and the literature survey of 43 references had distracted him from seeing the factual basis of the confirmed predictions, and then when the references and literature discussions were removed, he reversed his argument and simply ignored the facts presented in the paper by complaining instead that the 43 references and literature discussion were now missing from the paper! This contradiction is due to contriving inconsistent and trivial reasons for ignoring the hard science in both papers.

However, we'll improve the paper in an effort to reach a compromise and see what happens. Notice that the role of "Foundations of Physics" (and all other journals) is no longer to physically communicate science or data (which anybody can put on the internet), but is purely advertising/marketing/publicity/hype. With the internet available, nobody needs to publish in this or that journal/newspaper/TV show in order to directly make information physically available for people who actually want that information.

Instead, the role of these media is all about advertising or hyping a result, in other words, it is the purely unscientific, political act of making a song and dance out of science just to attract serious funding for further research. (Peer review politics is described in <http://vixra.org/abs/1211.0156>.)

0 0 Reply • Share ›



Nige Cook

10 years ago edited

This paper is also viewable in other formats at <http://archive.org/details/...> and

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/1...> (in online readable formats), and on amazon as the book: "Quantum gravity and the Standard Model." This is in a nascent and preliminary form. A properly organised textbook is on the way.

0 0 Reply • Share ›

NC

Nige Cook

11 years ago

Film outline of paper summary (you tube):

Quantum Gravity Film 11 November 2012 upload